THE ISRAELITE TRIBE

OF HALF-MANASSEH

by

ABRAHAM BERGMAN

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1935

Reprinted from
the JOURNAL OF THE PALESTINE ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
Vol. XVI, 1936, p. 224–254.

JERUSALEM
1936

THE ISRAELITE TRIBE

OF HALF-MANASSEH

by

ABRAHAM BERGMAN

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1935

Reprinted from
the JOURNAL OF THE PALESTINE ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
Vol. XVI, 1936, p. 224–254.

JERUSALEM
1936

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

THE ISRAELITE TRIBE OF HALF-MANASSEH[1]

ABRAHAM BERGMAN
(JERUSALEM)

ANALYSIS OF THE DOCUMENTS WHICH PRESENT THE ORIGIN AND GENEALOGIES OF HALF-MANASSEH

Concerning the origin of Manasseh, the Biblical information is rather cryptic. It states that Manasseh was born to Joseph, a son of Jacob, in Egypt, who gave the boy the name Manasseh because, "God made me forget all my hardships and all my father's home."[2] He was the first-born; but for some obscure reason, a fate equally shared by other first-born in the Biblical narrative,[3] he is placed second to Ephraim[4], who is henceforth the most important of the two. Indirectly, we hear that the ancestor of Manasseh, Joseph,

[1] Sincere acknowledgements are hereby expressed to Professor W. F. ALBRIGHT for his painstaking reading of the manuscript and for his valuable suggestions, all of which are duly noted in the body of the text. The writer wishes also to thank Professors F. R. BLAKE and J. LEWY for their kind cooperation and willingness to discuss with him a number of general problems connected with this article.—Note the following abbreviations used in this paper: *AASOR=Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*; *AB*=W. F. ALBRIGHT, *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*[3] (New York, 1935); *AJSL=American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature*; *BASOR=Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*; *DZA*=M. TH. BÖHL, *Das Zeitalter Abrahams, Der Alte Orient, 29*, 1 (1930); *EA*=J. A. KNUDTZON, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* (Leipzig, 1915); *GA*=ED. MEYER, *Geschichte des Altertums*,[2] hersg. von Dr. HANS ERICH STIER (Stuttgart, 1931); *HSAT=Die heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen, 1922–23); *IN*=ED. MEYER, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* (Halle, 1906); *JAOS=Journal of the American Oriental Society*; *JBL=Journal of Biblical Literature*; *JPOS=The Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*; *PEF. Qu. St.=Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement*; *PJB=Palästinajahrbuch*; *RB=Revue Biblique*; *System*=M. NOTH, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels* (Stuttgart, 1930); *ZAW=Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*; *ZDMG=Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*; *ZDPV=Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*

[2] Gen. 41^{51}.

[3] For possible explanations, cf. GORDON, *JBL* 54 (1935), 227, n. 25.

[4] Gen. 48^{13} ff. Cf. *PEF. Qu. St.* 61 (1929), 231ff. and a critical answer by NOTH, *System*, p. 23 f.

associated with the children of his father's Aramaean concubines, and that he was hated by his brothers.[5] We also learn of some hatred and a hope for superiority over his brother in Gen. 49^{22} ff., a hope which was apparently fulfilled in Dt. 33^{13} ff.

The first problem to be raised is that of the meaning of the name. Manasseh is explained by the Bible as derived from a root נשׁה meaning "to forget." This view is generally accepted by most scholars,[6] though EHRLICH[7] explains the name as the Piel of נשׂא.[8] The last suggestion, while attractive,[9] cannot be definitely established and we must conclude that the name מנשה is a hypocoristicon for מנשה־אל, a name whose analogical formation is to be found in names like ירחמאל (properly ירחם־אל?); יחזקאל = יחזק־אל(?); יהללאל, and others.[10] The meaning would be "God causes to forget"—some evil, trouble, etc.[11]

As a son of Joseph, Manasseh belongs to the tribe or clan Joseph, a descendant of Rachel and Jacob. Since he was "born" in Egypt, Manasseh was adopted by Jacob, i.e., he was brought into the confederacy of Jacob.[12] This, apparently, was not easily

[5] Gen. 37^{2} ff.

[6] So GUNKEL, STRACK, HOBERG, SKINNER, and others. The unusual form is explained by GESENIUS, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 52 § *m*, an explanation, incidentally, already pointed out by IBN EZRA in his commentary *ad loc.* ED. MEYER (*IN*, 515 f.), calls attention to the fact that the name is borne by an individual and consequently must have lost its tribal designation very early. Cf. also his discussion of the Greek form of the name, *ad loc.*

[7] *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, I (Leipzig, 1908), p. 211 f.

[8] MAHLER's eccentric suggestion, *ZDMG* 61 (1907), 628 f. is not to be taken seriously.

[9] A name מנשא or מנשׂא־אל would be very appropriate in the family of Joseph. Moreover, such a name formation is not uncommon in Semitics. Cf. *Nabu-reš-i-ši*, "Nabu, lift up my head" (TALLQVIST, *Assyrian Personal Names*, Helsingfors, 1914, p. 157), or *Sin-na-ši*, "Sin lifts up" (RANKE, *Early Babylonian Personal Names*, Philadelphia, 1905, p. 162). But the sibilant seems to be against it.

[10] The form מנשה appears in Assyrian as *Menasē* and *Mi-in-si-e*. It could have developed in the same way as from מנחם we have *Me-na-ḫi-me*, *Me-ni-ḫi-in-me*, *Mi-na-ḫi-mi* and *Min-ḫi-im-mu* (TALLQVIST, *op. cit.*, p. 136, 138).

[11] NOTH's elaborate interpretation (*Die israelitischen Personennamen*, Stuttgart, 1928, p. 211, n. 1 and p. 222), is unnecessary. The meaning of the root appears in the Assyrian *Mi-i-nu-la-an-ši* "how should I forget?" (TALLQVIST, *ad loc.*). For general remarks concerning names with *El* see ALBRIGHT, *JBL* 43 (1924), 371 f.

[12] It is impossible to mention all the theories concerning Joseph: his

accomplished, for many sources continue to speak of a "House of Joseph", a tribe Joseph, rather than of its two subdivisions. Thus the Blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49)[13] and of Moses (Dt. 33)[14] refer to Joseph as one entity, and not divided into one or more clans.[15] Consequently, both these blessings concerning Joseph must belong either to a period when Joseph as an entity or one ethnic group was known among the people, or to a time so remote from such a condition that a poet could speak about the group almost in legendary terms. It seems to me that the poems could not be a fanciful invention of a roaming troubadour, but a powerful, almost epic representation of a contemporary situation. It is also possible that with the beginning of a more conscious national existence under Samuel and Saul such epics began to receive definite shape in the literature of the people and formed more and more a part of the life of the nation. They probably received their final form, and were put in writing, during the peaceful and rich reign of Solomon. For after the disruption of the consolidated monarchy it is doubtful whether any such creations could suddenly spring up. If this view is correct, these epics developed during or immediately after the event, just as, according to the view now generally held, the Song of Deborah did.[16]

We find then that in these old documents there is mention only of a 'Joseph', who in the Song of Deborah is already divided into Ephraim and Machir, while Manasseh is not mentioned at all.[17] The latter's origin remains still obscure, but so much seems certain: he originated in a foreign territory, is not mentioned in some of the older documents dealing with the 'Joseph' settlement, and his name appears later in Israel as a personal name. More cannot be

migration, mythological character, relationship with the Hyksos, date of the story, etc. Cf. *AJSL* 37 (1920–21), 101 ff.; 47, 83 ff.; *JBL* 35 (1916), 167 f.; 37, 111 ff.; *ZAW* 3 N. F. (1926), 94 ff.

[13] For the date, cf. SKINNER, *Genesis* (New York, 1910), p. 533 and, PROCKSCH, *Die Genesis* (Leipzig, 1934), p. 282.

[14] We follow the date of König, *Das Deuteronomium* (Leipzig, 1917), p. 228 f. Cf. also PHYTHIAN-ADAMS, *JPOS* 3 (1923), 158 ff.

[15] *ZAW* 7 N. F. (1930), 295. (Dt. 33^{17b} is obviously a gloss).

[16] So, for example, MOORE, BURNEY and others.

[17] But he appears at about the same time, in the story of Gideon in the West, Jud. 6^{15}, and in the story of Jephthah in the East, Jud. 11^{29}. See below.

said until an analysis of our remaining documents is completed.

Of these documents the one which seems most complete is Nu. 26^{28} ff. It has been recently discussed by NOTH.[18] He has there brilliantly defended the thesis that Nu. 26 is an "einheitliches Stück", a few additions excepted, of course. Now, if Noth is correct in eliminating v. 28 etc. in chapter 26, then, in Joshua 17, verse 1 should also be eliminated. We thus get a homogeneous genealogy of Manasseh,[19] which is the basis for the other documents such as Nu. 27^{1} ff., 36^{1} ff. Of this genealogy, Machir is the only name to be found in 1 Chr. 2^{18-24} while in 1 Chr. 5^{23}f. there is no mention of any at all. The other document which mentions Manasseh is 1 Chr. 7^{14-19}, in which part of the above-mentioned genealogy can be detected, but where also remnants of some other list or lists can be seen. The question immediately arises, whether these genealogies refer to the same clans and tribes of Manasseh, and if not whether they can be identified with a certain degree of probability. The answer to the first question is in the negative, while to the last one it is in the affirmative.

For when we observe the documents in Numbers and Joshua, we note that the names represented in these lists are also found as place names in Western Palestine, in the territory alloted to Manasseh in the central highland of Mt. Ephraim.[20] This fact has been definitively proven by the discovery and interpretation of the ostraca of Samaria.[21] The ostraca date, apparently, from the reign of Ahab in the middle of the ninth century B.C. (874–852) and show that "those tribal subdivisions have become administrative units."[22] When did this development begin? It is very likely that it began during the time of Solomon, for Solomon, as is well-known,[23]

[18] *System*, p. 122 ff. [19] Note however the slight variations in the order of the names in Numbers and Joshua.

[20] We disregard for a moment the mention of Gilead, but preserve the reference to Zelophehad and his daughters, which NOTH omits from Nu. 26.

[21] A complete discussion is to be found in DIRINGER, *Le iscrizioni antico-ebraiche Palestinesi* (Florence, 1934), p. 21 ff. His bibliography is up-to-date except for NOTH, *System*, p. 125 ff. and MAISLER, *JPOS* 14 (1934), 96 ff.

[22] OLMSTEAD, *History of Palestine and Syria* (New York, 1931), p. 372 ff. Recent investigations may require, perhaps, the lowering of the age of the ostraca to the eighth century. [23] I K. 4. See *The Administrative Divisions of Israel and Judah*, by ALBRIGHT, *JPOS* 5 (1925), 17 ff.

reorganized the districts of Palestine and divided the whole country into administrative units. Therefore if Nu. 26 still reflects the tribal and clan organization, it would have to go back to a period preceding the time of Solomon. Indeed, NOTH[24] dates the whole of Nu. 26, excluding a few verses, noted on page 124 of his book, to the period between the Song of Deborah and the reign of David, i. e., between the 12th and 10th centuries B.C. At such an early date we have in Western Palestine clans known to be Manassite.[25] Consequently, the documents of Jos. and Nu. should be differentiated from those of the Chronicler. The latter will be shown to contain a more complete genealogy of Eastern Manasseh. The analysis of the documents, however, is extremely difficult.[26]

Verse 14 of 1 Chr. 7 begins as follows: בני מנשה אשריאל אשר ילדה, וגו". There does not seem to be any doubt that this verse preserves the same genealogy credited to Manasseh in Nu. 26 and Jos. 17. Originally the verse probably had: בני מנשה אשריאל, שכם, חפר, וג'ו (אשר ילדה is dittography of the preceding אשריאל influenced by the ילדה of the next clause).[27] Some of the remaining names of this genealogy (the western one) are to be found in vv. 18 f. (see below). Our verse (v. 14), however, proceeds to tell us that out of some relationship of Manasseh with an Aramaean concubine (country, clan, or tribe?) there was born Machir, father of Gilead.

There follows then a list of names unlike any other Manassite genealogy, and whose meaning is anything but clear. A discussion of these names, therefore, will appear in its place. From it, it will be observed that the names show a preponderance of Arabic etyma, a fact which while not of primary importance yet can be noted in our discussion. It has been pointed out by HALÉVY[28] and stressed by MONTGOMERY[29] that there was a continual influx

[24] *Op. cit.*, p. 129 f.

[25] Cf. also Gideon's clan אביעזר in Jud. 6–8 and see our discussion below.

[26] This analysis, nevertheless, must be undertaken. The information in the Book of Chronicles can no longer be dismissed as purely fictitious. Its historical importance has been repeatedly stressed by ALBRIGHT, NOTH and KLEIN.

[27] This was first suggested by RICHTER, *ZAW* 34 (1914), 133ff., who, however, gave it up later (*ibid.*, 1932, 134). ALBRIGHT, *JPOS* 5 (1925), 28, n. 28 reads the verse as we do. He did not, however, know of RICHTER's reading.

[28] *Essai sur les inscriptions du Safa* (Paris, 1887), p. 120.

[29] See his *Arabia and the Bible* (Philadelphia, 1934), *passim*.

of Arabic tribes into Palestine from the earliest times. If such a theory is correct, then Transjordan, on the border of the desert, would certainly be the first recipient of such an influx. The fact that our names show exactly such an influence, strengthened by the fact that since this Manassite genealogy does not refer to the west,[30] it must consequently refer to the eastern half of the tribe, and especially since these genealogies are connected with Gilead and Aram, terms designating territories or peoples belonging unquestionably to Eastern Palestine—all this seem to prove that the genealogy of 1 Chr. 7^{14} ff. cannot but refer to the Half-Manasseh of *ʿEber hay-Yarden*.

This genealogy is found in a document which is obviously corrupt.[31] To discuss all the views of scholars as to the original text, will require too much space and will be of little value.[32] I modestly propose to read the text as follows:

V. 14^a בני מנשה אשריאל, שכם ...וג׳ן, אשר אשתו ילדה[33]

V. 14^b; פילגשו הארמיה ילדה את מכיר אבי גלעד

V. 15^a ומכיר לקח אשה ושם אשתו[34] מעכה.

V. 16^{35} ותלד מעכה אשת מכיר בן ותקרא שמו פרש ושם אחיו שרש ובניו אולם ורקם

V. 17^a (?)וגו . . . ובני אולם בדן. Here must have followed the list of the genealogies of the other ancestors, a list unfortunately missing.[36] The section closes with v. 17^b אלה בני גלעד בן מכיר בן מנשה. V. 18 then resumes the western genealogy to which v. 15^b probably belongs. How to account for this mixture in the text escapes us.

[30] Cf. above.

[31] MELAMED's attempts (*Turbiz* V [1934], 123 ff.) to keep the text intact are not convincing. For his general thesis cf. already CLERMONT-GANNEAU, *Archaeological Researches*, Vol. II, p. 80, and ALBRIGHT, *AASOR* IV [1922–23], 47.

[32] Besides the standard commentaries, see *ZAW* 34 (1914), 133 ff.; 6 N. F. (1929), 104 ff.; 9 N. F., 134 ff.; *JPOS* 5 (1925) 28, n. 28 and p. 43, n. 62; NOTH, *System*, *passim*.

[33] The only addition here is the word אשתו. The *athnah* in the Masoretic text after ילדה seems to bring to a close the thought expressed in v. 14^a. Originally it contained the genealogy of Western Manasseh. Having disposed of them, the text proceeds to describe the eastern branch.

[34] Or perhaps the original אחתו is correct. I omit the words חפים ושפים as a gloss, following the commentators.

[35] V. 15^b was probably inserted from a lower verse, possibly v. 18.

[36] Perhaps to be found in 1 Chr. 5^{24}. See below.

Our text seems to be correct, however, in representing שכם as a son of שמידע.[37]

To what period does our text belong? The *terminus a quo* must be the relationship with the Aramaeans; the *terminus ad quem* could be the age of the ostraca of Samaria where שכם appears as a subdistrict of שמידע, i.e., the middle of the ninth centurg B. C.[38] The Aramaeans have had a long history,[39] yet the real immediate contact with the Israelites was during the time of David, who successfully checked their advance from the north and repulsed them.[40] But the Aramaeans remained in Syria and, during the reign of Solomon and immediately after the disruption of the monarchy, their advance southwards continued. It would be only natural for the Transjordanian tribes to seek alliances with the enemy who was threatening to annihilate them. Such a situation might account for Machir's association with Maachah. If so, the *terminus a quo* of our document would be about the tenth century B. C. which would coincide also with its *terminus ad quem*. For it is possible that the subdivisions which appear on our ostraca go back originally to the reign of Solomon. If so, we have narrowed the age of our document to about the middle of the tenth century B. C., to which 1 Chr. 7^{14-19} belongs.

The Chronicler has preserved two more documents which we must consider: 1 Chr. 5^{23} f. and 2^{18-24}. We begin with the first. The text presents many difficulties and the commentators have offered just as many reconstructions.[41] But the reading of the verse seems to me exceedingly simple, viz.: v. 23^{a} ובני חצי שבט מנשה ישבו

[37] Albright, *JPOS* 5 (1925), 43, n. 62, calls attention to this fact.

[38] That the administrative divisions of Israel continued in the same manner after the death of Ahab is not improbable. However, in view of the political decline of the state and the continual attacks by Assyria and Aram, a new organization might have been introduced. Cf. also n. 22. It is possible, however, that the ostraca date from the reign of Jeroboam II.

[39] Cf. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, p. 131 ff.; Unger, *Forschungen und Fortschritte*, 4 (1928), p. 226 ff.; Albright, *JPOS* 12 (1932), 207 f., and *AJSL* 44 (1927–28), 35.

[40] 2 Sam. 8^{3-11}; Olmstead, *op. cit.*, p. 323 ff.; Ed. Meyer, *GA*, 11, 2, 252 f.

[41] The latest (*ZAW* 9 N. F. [1932], 133) is the wildest. Richter also sins against Hebrew idiom when in v. 18 he emends יָצְאֵי צבא, a perfectly good Hebrew expression, to the barbarism יָצְאוּ צבא

ביבשן עד בעל־חרמון, וישניר והר חרמון, וכל־בנון המה רבו[43] בארצם[42]; v. 23[b] In v. 24 it seems that ועפר (note the conjunction) is really in the middle of the sentence, the beginning of which might have had a few more names now missing. I believe that the solution can be found if we compare this text with that of Chapter 7, where as I have already pointed out, v. 17[a] seems to be cut off and a number of names missing there. The continuation of this verse I see in v. 24. That even so the text is far from complete is quite obvious, for it is impossible to assume that the whole list in v. 24 represents the descendants only of Ulam. More than that cannot, however, be deduced at present.[44]

The date of our document is not easy to determine. If our reading of v. 23 is correct, the time then must have been a period of general conquest in Israel. We inevitably turn to the age of David and Solomon. The "sons" of Manasseh, having already established themselves, are now seeking new conquests. Such a desire could materialize only if it were facilitated by a strong military advance on the part of the state. Such advance and assistance could be expected during the time of David, who on the other hand, could not succeed, unless supported by precisely the same tribesmen desirous of conquest. That the tribes were eager for war, can be seen from the account of the war with the Hagarenes which precedes v. 23 in our chapter.[45] Our document

[42] Note the *athnaḥ* after בארץ. The מ of בארצם could have fallen out through haplography. V. 23[a] thus informs us of the fact that the tribe dwelt in his own land (literally, "the sons of the tribe—in their land)". But as a result of some expansion perhaps, the settlement of the tribe extended further north, and that is what v. 23[b] aims to tell, viz., that the Manassites had extended their territory to the northwest. [43] Following Codex B.

[44] The suggestion can be made, of course, that the list represents successive generations. If so, we have eight generations. Counting twenty-five years a generation, we have 200 years, which if added to 732 B. C. (the year of the fall of Damascus and the approximate date of Tiglath-Pilesser III conquests in Transjordan), gives the date of c. 932. This coincides well with the date we have ascribed to the document in 1 Chr. 7^{14-19}.

[45] Cf. *IN*, 326 ff.; LUCKENBILL, *Ancient Records*, 1 (Chicago, 1926), p. 283, etc.; GAUTHIER, *Dictionnaire des noms géographiques*, IV (Cairo, 1927), p. 7 and 223; MONTGOMERY, *op. cit.*, p. 35, n. 16. If the reference in 1 Chr. 5^{10} is correct, and there is no *a priori* reason to doubt that it is, then also the reference in vv. 18–22 is correct, and these wars would have taken place during the eleventh-tenth centuries B. C.

would then refer to such conquests and victories of the Transjordanian clans under the leadership of David. If so, our document belongs to the early tenth century B. C.

There is one more document in the book of Chronicles which is of interest to us, chapter 2^{18-24}. For our purpose, we shall deal only with v. 21 ff. Hezron, the well-known Judahite patriarch (cf. v. 5 and 9) is associated with a sister of Gilead, who bears Segub, the father of Jair.[46] Ed. Meyer suggested[47] that Hezron is here really the descendant of Reuben (cf. Chap. 5^{3}) and not of Judah. Following this suggestion[48] we conclude that vv. 21 f. reflect an association of a Reubenite clan with a "daughter of Machir".[49] The "offspring" of that relationship was Segub whose more famous descendant was Jair.[50] The latter, who unlike Segub probably

[46] The possibility that Hezron, the Judahite, represents here a post-exilic community (Benzinger, *Die Bücher der Chronik*, Leipzig, 1901, p. 9) is out of the question. This suggestion is a possibility to Curtiss (*The Books of the Chronicles*, New York, 1910, p. 91 f.). The latter's suggestion that *Segub* is an error of transcription for *Argob* is better, but improbable.

[47] *IN*, 519, n. 1. This view is supported by Rothstein, *Das erste Buch der Chronik* (Leipzig, 1927), p. 92 f.

[48] Noth has shown (*ZDPV* 55 [1932], 103) that v. 24 in our chapter belongs to the genealogy of Judah; and while he disclaims v. 19, yet both v. 19 and 20 (see his reconstructed list on page 106) show relationship to that genealogy. We are thus justified in accepting Rothstein's view (*op. cit.*, p. 24) that vv. 21–23 are an interpolation reflecting a genealogy other than Judaean.

[49] The text is difficult. As a possible construction, I offer the following suggestion: ואחר בא חצרון אל בת מכיר אבי גלעד והוא לקחה ותלד לו את שגוב, ושגוב הוליד את יאיר ויהי לו עשרים ושלש ערים בארץ הגלעד. Something seems to be missing here. This section then concludes; כל אלה בני מכיר אבי גלעד. Something else is then missing, at the end of which comes the closing statement: ויקח (ויקחו) גשור וארם את חות יאיר מאתם (or ואתם, cf. end of n. 50.) את קנת ואת בנותיה, i. e. — שִׁשִּׁים עיר.

[50] The association between the two clans can be explained according to Morgenstern (*ZAW* 6 N. F. [1929], 91 ff.) who pointed out the existence of *beena* marriage in ancient Israel, especially before the time of David. Whether we adopt this view without reservation or not is immaterial at present; but that movements from tribe to tribe whether for the sake of marriage, war, or even for feeding the cattle in time of famine (note, in passing, that the territory of Reuben is a war-ridden one, while Gilead is a land practically unsettled) must have taken place is quite obvious. As a result of such movements and associations new clans and new tribes which traced their descent to either or both of their dual parentage, must have developed. In such a

achieved success and secured importance in Gilead came, as a result of that, to be recognized as the son of Gilead proper and, consequently, as the son of Manasseh (Nu. 32^{41}, Dt. 3^{14}).

Having completed the analysis of our documents, we may add one more word about the complete genealogy of Eastern Manasseh. We shall now also take account of the verses we omitted in Jos. 17 and Nu. 26. From Nu. 26^{28}; Jos. 17^{1}; 1 Chr. $7^{14,17}$ (we disregard the genealogy of Segub and Jair, since its development, as has been explained, is of a different nature) there appears invariably this genealogical line: Manasseh-Machir-Gilead. In Nu. and Jos. this is preceded by Joseph. One cannot but come to the following conclusion: Gilead, a land, was conquered by Machir, a son, or major clan, of Manasseh. The latter, too, was a son, or clan, of Joseph. In the course of time the land Gilead assumed human form in the eyes of tradition. Hence, the genealogical lists, which represented the subsequent occupation of Gilead by various other clans, have been attributed to Gilead as the "land-ancestor", whose descendants they became. Thus developed the genealogical lists of 1 Chr. 7^{14-17} and 5^{24} on the one hand, and that of 1 Chr. 2^{21} f. on the other. The process of settlement and the eventual fate of these clans belongs to another chapter. We first turn to the story of the settlement.

way, the existence of Segub (of whom we know nothing) and Jair, as well as of Nobah (Nu. 32^{42}), must be explained. At what time did this development begin? It seems impossible to answer this yet, but if our analysis of Nu. 32^{39} ff. (see below) is correct, this event would have to precede that of Nu. 32^{41}. Consequently, before the 13th–12th century B.C. Our document, however, cannot be dated with any degree of probability. The difficulty of the number sixty cities (Jair had only twenty-three) is cleared up by RICHTER's emendation (*ZAW* 34 [1914], 110 f.). Incidentally, RICHTER has changed his views (*ibid.*, 1931, p. 261 f.).

Analysis of the Documents which Reflect the Process of the Settlement of Half-Manasseh.

Chapter 32 in the Book of Numbers presents more problems than one. The writer hopes to discuss it at a future date. Now, however, he will deal with v. 39 ff. only, for this section has no apparent connexion with the preceding, and must have been part of the annals which specified the advancement of the clan. It is perhaps to be connected with the whole cycle of documents to which Jud. 1 belonged.[1] V. 40, as has been seen by most scholars, is an insertion in this section for the purpose of conforming it to the whole tendency of the chapter. For scholars generally agree that the chapter originally dealt with two tribes, Reuben and Gad, and that Manasseh represents a later addition.[2] This view is probably correct, but the historical significance of this fact has not been seen by the scholars, as will be pointed out.

Vv. 39 ff. attempt to describe, in military fashion, the process of the advance of clans of Manasseh into the land of Gilead, whence they drove the Amorites out.[3] The term Gilead is an exceedingly flexible one. Here, however, it appears that the northern section between the Jabbok and the Yarmûk is referred

[1] Gray, *Numbers* (New York, 1903), p. 438. The footnotes will be renumbered in each section of the paper.

[2] Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 427 points out that the usual order is here reversed to Gad and Reuben, a fact which may reflect the situation at the time of the composition of the chapter when Reuben had already deteriorated. I may add that if we compare this fact with the information in the Mesha inscription, we can get the approximate date for the whole chapter about the beginning of the 9th century B.C., or even earlier.

[3] Holzinger, *Numeri* (Leipzig, 1903), p. 158 reads ארמי for אמרי, but this is unnecessary. It has been demonstrated that Biblical tradition is probably correct in designating the population of Palestine and Transjordan before the arrival of the Israelites as Amorites; cf. the work of Lewy, especially *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 4 N.F. (1929), 243 ff., and see *JPOS* 8 (1928), 250 ff. as well as *RB* 40 (1931), 161 ff. (the last instalment of Dhorme's articles), and references there. The problem involved is really of a different nature. For we have pointed out (*JAOS* 54 [1934], 175 ff.) that the clans of Manasseh settled in a territory not previously inhabited by a sedentary population. If so, how shall we interpret the verse וירש את האמרי אשר בה? Two possibilities can be considered.

to.[4] Somewhere in this territory Jair too made his conquests. This clan, who did not belong to the descendants of Machir, as has been already shown, went and conquered the *ḥawwôt* of Ham (following my reading in *JAOS* 54 [1934], 176) and called them *ḥawwôt Jair*. In other words, Jair, having conquered the hamlets of the district of Ham, occupied these *ḥawwôt*, settled in them, and proceeded to live there, for a while at least, the semi-nomadic existence of his predecessors. Thus the "father" of the clan appears to have been "born" in Gilead proper. In Nu. 32^{41} he is a son of Manasseh. This means that our document represents the tradition that Jair has been already incorporated among the Manassite clans and possibly become one of the major ones. At what time? Before answering this question, let us study the information in Jud. 10^{3-5}.[5]

If we take the verse literally, i.e., the Israelites actually drove out the Amorites, then these latter were the nomadic or semi-nomadic population of the hills of ʿAjlûn, who had to leave the country as the result of the approach of the Israelites. The latter settled the country and became eventually its sedentary population. The second alternative is that actually there were no settlements in our territory, and consequently no expulsions; but since tradition had it that the Amorites dwelt in the whole land, it was only natural to assume that also in ʿAjlûn the Amorites had to be driven out in order to give room for the coming Israelites. Of the two possibilities, I prefer the first, which is strengthened by the fact that Jair, in v. 41, has to conquer the *ḥawwôt* of Ham—the settlement of semi-nomadic people. It should be pointed out, however, that while the term וירש seems to presuppose the disappearance of these Amorites, it would be more accurate to say, as shall be shown later, that, actually, there was here only a normal process of assimilation. The document, written at a time when the Amorites no longer existed, assumed, what seemed most logical, their complete extermination.

[4] Cf. *JAOS* 54 (1934), 174 f..

[5] In Nu. 32^{42} Nobaḥ, whose ancestry is unknown, went to conquer Ḳenath, modern Ḳanawât, whose name he changed into "Nobaḥ". (The name has not been preseved probably because the territory was reconquered afterwards by the Aramaeans—cf. I Chr. 2^{23}—who restored to the city its ancient name). One is immediately reminded of Nobaḥ in Jud. 8^{11}. ED. MEYER (*IN*, 518; *GA*, II, 2, 232) suggested that Nobaḥ there is really the new name of Ḳenath, as our document would have it. Gideon's march was thus towards the east to Ḳenath or Nobaḥ and then to the south, by the *ḥajj* route to Yogbeha (modern el-Ajbehât). This attractive theory, however, disregards the fact that Gideon spoke to the people of Succoth and Penuel (on the western side of Gilead) and that Ḳanawât is too far out of the way of the pilgrim route which

Moore[6] has pointed out that the judge Jair, like the other minor judges, is really a personification of the whole clan. Now the information in Jud. 10^{3-5} is, that this judge has thirty sons who ride on thirty donkeys and own thirty עירים called *ḥawwôt-Jair*. When Jair died he was buried in Ḳamôn. This is a brief paragraph seething with problems. V. 4 is somewhat confused. I suggest reading it as follows: ויהי לו שלשים בנים רכבים על שלשים עירים. ושלשים עירים להם (אשר בארץ הגלעד). להם יקראו חות-יאיר עד היום הזה[7]. Our verse, while not completely smooth, is at least now intelligible. Still, the word עירים seems to present difficulties.[8] But there are none.[9] The paronomasia is obvious and it would be a crime to "correct" the text.[10] These *ḥawwôt* are in I Chr. 2^{22} twenty-three; here thirty. This discrepancy might have arisen either from a mistake by analogy with Jud. 12^{14}, as most commentators believe, or, which is more plausible, because of a scribal error arising from the omission of the twenty in twenty-three and then increasing the number three to thirty, as Feigin suggests.[11]

runs through Edreʿi to Gadda and ʿAmmân. Furthermore, while it is true that an attack from the rear might be unexpected and therefore successful, yet such strategy would require a greater effort than Gideon was probably able to make. If, in spite of our objections, Ed. Meyer is right, then our document must go back to before Gideon's time, before 1100 B. C.

[6] *Judges* (New York, 1895), p. xxviii.

[7] The transposition might have easily occurred to a scribe misled by the להם of the last clause. When he discovered his error he probably added, in the margin, or at the end of the sentence, the words he had left out.

[8] Budde, *Das Buch der Richter* (Leipzig, 1897), p. 79; Burney, *Judges* (London, 1920), p. 292, read ערים for עירים. But this is wrong, for it sins against the law of *difficilior lectio*. That some versions have ערים is the result of their ignorance of the Hebrew construction.

[9] Already Rashi (see his commentary *ad loc.*) pointed out that this is the form commonly found in its feminine עיירות, "little cities or hamlets" which, incidentally, fits the term *ḥawwah* perfectly.

[10] Cf. also Oettli, *Das Deuteronomium u. d. Bücher Josua u. Richter* (München, 1893), p. 265; Yellin, לשוננו 5 (1933), p. 291 f. The question is really of a different nature: Why the thirty ass-colts, and why should the sons be riding on them? Prof. Albright suggests, that the thirty ass-colts are aetiological in origin, being invented to explain the עירים (people said, why did the sons own thirty עירים—hamlets? and answered, probably because they rode on thirty עירים—ass-colts).

[11] *JBL* 50 (1931), 195 f. This is his best suggestion in that article. The assumption that Jephthah is the son of a person Jair-Gilead is out of the question.

What are the sons? The combination of the views of MOORE[12] and NOWACK[13] seems to be the correct one, i.e., the "judge" Jair, his twenty-three (or thirty) "sons", the twenty-three (or thirty) ass-colts and the twenty-three (or thirty עירים) reflect a period of superiority in this clan, of advantage over the other clans, and of conquest and victory. If so, two questions arise: Where and when.

The answer to the first question takes us to v. 5 where it is stated that Jair was buried in Ḳamôn, modern Ḳamm.[14] Was that the ancient seat of the tribe or a new center? If our reading in Nu. 32^{41} (חוֹת הם) is correct, then the second alternative is the right one. In other words, when the various clans moved northward to conquer new territories, Jair went too and conquered Ham. He then continued further north and northwest, to the district of Ḳamôn and where some of the twenty-three (or thirty) hamlets were.[15] Nobaḥ, too moved north, but went northeast to the conquest of Ḳanawât.

The answer to the second question involves the chronology of the minor judges, which has not been solved yet.[16] It is evident though that during the time of the Judges in the twelfth-eleventh centuries B. C., the Jairites and their *ḥawwôt* or עירים, played an important rôle in the history of the territory. It is possible that their advances and wars of conquest in the north weakened the remaining clans of Gilead, and thus enabled Ammon to gain in force and attack the land. This fact, the absence of their important clan, will account for the Gileadites' demand for assistance from the brigand Jephthah. If this supposition is correct, then Jud. 10^{3-5} would have to precede the time of Jephthah; in other words, some time during the twelfth century. Especially would it be so if we would assume that the weakness of the Gileadites was caused, on the other hand, by Machir's movement to the west (cf. Jud. 5^{14}).

[12] *Op. cit.*, p. 273.

[13] *Richter, Ruth u. Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen, 1902), p. 97.

[14] Cf. *IN*, 517; BURNEY, *op. cit.*, p. 293. The site is described in *PJB*, I (1905), 61. I do not know, however, whether it possesses Bronze Age and Iron Age remains.

[15] Dt. 3^{14} extends the northern boundary up to Geshur and Maachah and includes the land of Argob.

[16] See now some pertinent remarks by ALT, *Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts* (Leipzig, 1934), p. 31 ff.

If we return now to our text in Nu. $32^{39,41}$ f., and if the analysis of Jud. 10^{3-5} is correct, then the former document would reflect an age preceding the latter. MOORE,[17] KITTEL[18] ascribe to it great antiquity. One cannot escape the same conclusion. Older than Jud. 1, our section would be placed at the end of the thirteenth century B. C.[19]

The next document under consideration is Dt. 3^{1} ff. esp. [13] ff., which is the most complete account of the Transjordanian conquest we have. In it it is stated that Moses conquered Transjordan of which Bashan[20] and יתר הגלעד was given to Half Manasseh, while Jair, son of Manasseh, took חבל ארגב and Machir received Gilead. What situation does the text represent? In order to attempt an answer, we must be permitted a slight digresssion.

In I Kings 4, Transjordan is divided into two districts whose capitals are Ramoth-Gilead (v. 13) and Mahanaim (v. 14).[21] A comparison between this document and Dt. 3 reveals that the district of Ramoth-Gilead corresponds to that given to Machir, Jair, etc. But of these territories we know that only Gilead was in the hands of the Israelites and that even during the time of David, Jaulân and Ḥaurân were occupied by the Aramaean tribes of Geshur and Maachah.[22] Furthermore, in I Kings 4 the capital of the district is Ramoth-Gilead, south of the Yarmûk. No mention is made there of ʿAštaroth and Ḳarnaim, the mighty cities of the traditional ʿOg and Bashan. It will appear impossible that had these cities been in the hands of the Israelites they would not have been mentioned.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 274. [18] *HSAT*, 1, 389.

[19] The idea of REUBENI (שם חם ויפת [Tel-Aviv, 1932,] p. 64 f.) identifying Jair both with Egyptian Yaa ( ) of the Sinuhe story and Assyrian Ya'uri of the fourteenth century B. C. is wrong. The first identification is phonetically difficult (should be y not), and historically impossible. The second is both historically and phonetically impossible.

[20] The best geographical discussion of these territories is to be found in ABEL, *Géographie de la Palestine* (Paris, 1933). For Argob see also n. 24, below.

[21] Ramoth-Gilead is to be identified with Tell el-Ḥuṣn (*BASOR* 35, 11). Mahanaim is still unidentified, though DALMAN thinks it is Tulûl eḍ-Ḍahab (*PJB* 9 [1913], 68 ff.).

[22] The identification of these tribes has not been made yet. From our investigation, however, we have concluded that they lived in territories which would have to be placed not much farther than the northern bank of the Yarmûk.

We must deduce, therefore, that even at the height of the Israelite empire, in the time of Solomon whom tradition credited with a rule extending up to the Euphrates,[23] the northern boundary of its Transjordanian possessions did not extend further than the Yarmûk (though it might have incorporated southern Ḥaurân, up to Salkah, modern Salḫad, in Jebel ed-Drûz).

This fact is extremely important. For even though we do not know where Argob was,[24] yet it, too, was not further north than ʿAštaroth and Ḳarnaim. Now if we follow this line of thought, we notice that it is nowhere stated that these two cities were conquered (for Jos. 13, see presently). Moses' battle took place at Edreʿi. Og's cities, according to Dt. 3^{10}, were also limited to a territory south of Edreʿi. Solomon's governor was in Ramoth-Gilead, again not far from Edreʿi. Ahab's aspirations also did not extend farther than Ramoth-Gilead (I Kings 22). Even Jeroboam II, the last great king of Israel before the fall of Samaria in 722/1, while defeating Aram (cf. II Kings 14^{23-29}; Amos 6^{13}), and perhaps subjugating them for a while, could not establish a lasting rule in northern Transjordan and his territories were lost to Israel after his death (II Kings 15 f.). Besides these facts, the Aramaeans during the first centuries of the first millennium B.C., continually pressed southward. The deduction from these statements would warrant, it seems to me, the conclusion that the Israelites perhaps never reached much farther than the Yarmûk to the north, and Salkah to the east. Yet tradition is invariable in giving the Israelites

[23] I Kings 5^{1} ff. Possibly this only means that he controlled the trade and caravan routes, just as perhaps the Reubenites did (I Chr. 5^{9}).

[24] Argob cannot be el-Lejâh, for the Israelites probably could not have conquered this naturally fortified and impregnable territory. Furthermore, it seems incredible that the Israelites would conquer a land whose sole importance lies in its ability to harbor criminals. The Israelites were seeking territory for a sedentary occupation. Argob could not refer to Ḥaurân either, for the land is usually referred to as Bashan. Neither to ʿAjlûn, for the land is known as Gilead. Jebel ed-Drûz is then the only possibility left. But were there sixty cities? Possibly. The whole territory of the upper Yarmûk basin reveals ancient settlements. However, it will be better to suppose that Argob was a general administrative term designating this whole territory or parts of it, in which the imposing remains of the Rephaim and their mighty cities were to be seen. (Cf. Dt. 3^{4} f.). If this supposition is correct, an exact identification cannot, and perhaps never will be, definitely established.

Bashan, the territory of ʿOg who ruled in ʿAštaroth (e.g., Dt. 3^{13}, Jos. 13^{31}). It was a mighty kingdom with mighty cities which tradition connects with Moses' victories. How can we account for such a tradition when the facts seem to oppose it? The answer I give is a complicated one, but nevertheless it is clear. It includes the Ḫabiru and the Amarna period.

Early in the career of the Ḫabiru we hear of their conquest, or occupation, of ʿAštaroth.[25] How much more they conquered and what happened to their conquest, we do not know. We find Ḫabiru, or reference to them, also in central Transjordan.[26] If they once conquered or occupied ʿAštaroth they would not have difficulty in conquering the land of Gari[27] and then proceeding further south. That these Ḫabiru did not disappear entirely can be safely surmised. Any people who would come to occupy their territory would, by necessity, come in contact with them. It is logical to assume that part of their tradition and lore would be adopted by the new conquerors.[28] Such must have been the case both in Western and Eastern Palestine. The documents which we have thus preserve a mixed tradition of the early Ḫabiru as well as that of the late Israelites. That is precisely what happened in Deut. 3.

In Dt. 3^{13-15} there is a clear distinction between Half-Manasseh, Jair, and Machir. How did such a distinction develop? It does not seem to me to have been a development at all. Rather, I see here a preservation of an old tradition, remnants of a pre-Israelite one, which has become mixed up with later traditions. In this later one, Bashan appears to have been conquered. So it was. But this conquest goes back to the time of the Ḫabiru and not the Israelites, as has been already shown. This fact notwithstanding, in Israelite lore the conquest appeared as having been accomplished by Moses. The second step was then an attempt to account for the settlement of the land. Some of it was probably occupied by the ancient Ḫabiru—the oldest layer of the Hebrew population which we can trace. In our document this layer appears under the general and unspecific term of Half-Manasseh. This Half-

[25] *EA*, letter 197. [26] *EA*, letter 256.

[27] We accept Albright's identification (*AASOR* 6 [1924–25], 40 f.) as against that of Alt and Noth (*JPOS* 12 [1932], 126 ff.; 1935, 42 ff.).

[28] Cf. also Barton, *JBL* 48 (1929), 144 ff.

Manasseh thus designated not only that older layer of the population, but also the newcomers, the little clans who were not large or important enough to be called by a special name. Together these went to compose in later tradition the tribe Half-Manasseh. However, among the conquering and settling tribes there were those who had achieved greatness and importance either before settling, or after their settlement when strengthened with some of the original clans who had not become Half-Manasseh. Such a one was Jair, who received "Argob"—the territory around the Yarmûk basin, including northern Gilead. This group might have been a second layer of the population. Another one was Nobaḥ, further east. Another one was Machir, who settled in Gilead proper.[29] Whether these groups present consecutive settlements or a contemporary development cannot be determined. Some were contemporary, others probably followed each other. For tradition preserved only fragments of their past, as for example in Dt. 3.

Before proceeding to another document, there is one more fact to consider in order to unravel the apparent confusion of our text. This is the topography of David's wars. These wars carried David well into Transjordan up to the Yarmûk. It would be inevitable that these wars and victories, which mark the highest peak in Israel's military achievements, should be noticed by tradition. Whether handed down in Transjordan proper or in western Palestine, the new tradition appeared in the course of time side by side with the older one. Possibly, as time passed by, parts of it became incorporated into the original one. When finally tradition was put into writing the document presented anything but a uniform picture. Thus, from an original conquest of Bashan and part of Gilead by the Ḫabiru in the fourteenth century B. C.; from further tribal movements in the following century or two; from the decisive conquest and settlement during the thirteenth century and from David's wars—there arose a tradition represented in our document.

[29] The view that the Joseph tribes were already in the country in the fourteenth century B. C. (see recently ALBRIGHT, *BASOR* 58, 14 ff.) will be mentioned later. If this view is correct, then our cautious conclusion may become much bolder. The conquest of Transjordan in the fifteenth-fourteenth century B. C. was actually already that of the tribe known by its later name of Half-Manasseh.

Nowhere else is Prof. ALBRIGHT's warning[30] to be heeded more: here is the oldest tradition in the youngest document.[31]

Our next document is Jos. 13. Contrary to the current opinion of scholars,[32] this section with its tribal divisions seems to be an unified one. It is a clear summary of tradition which the redactor of Joshua took great pains to preserve. The various traditions were incorporated into one text not so much to present a homogeneous picture of what the redactor thought it should be, but to preserve the tradition as it was handed down, without tampering with it. The traditions, at times, conflicted with each other: the fact that they still do so speaks for their primary origin. The heterogeneous documents were preserved at the expense of an uniform tradition and a clearly reconstructed history. It is indeed a tribute to the historical sense of our redactor. Furthermore, we must note that whether J, E, JE, P, etc., of which we have been accustomed to speak, really ever existed or not, yet a land like Transjordan must have had its own tradition. That tradition has been lost. For our documents probably represent mostly the western recension. Wherever possible, the little preserved of the eastern tradition was introduced. It knew of two and a half tribes which settled in Transjordan. The information concerning them appears with the least confusion in Jos. 13, which it is now our duty to interpret.

Our section begins in v. 7 with a slight difficulty. Following the Septuagint, the Peshitta, and some of the commentators,[33] we add כי חצי שבט to v. 7 (before the last word) which probably fell out of the text through *homoeoteleuton*. The rest of this section offers no difficulties, but v. 29 is slightly corrupt. I think it can be easily reconstructed if we compare it with v. 15 and v. 24. Thus we get: v. 29 ויתן משה לחצי מטה בני מנשה למשפחתם. V. 30a, following the Syriac version and by comparison with v. 16 and v. 25,[34] would

[30] *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 1930, p. 460, n. 1.

[31] The date of the document cannot be determined. The reason is obvious from our discussion.

[32] See e. g., HOLZINGER, *HSAT*, I, 350 f. NOTH's discussion (*ZDPV* 58 [1935], 185 ff.) is of interest, but his conclusions (esp. p. 230 ff.) seem untenable to me.

[33] E. g., STEUERNAGEL, *Deuteronomium u. Josua* (Göttingen, 1900), p. 201.

[34] Naturally, if scholars reject the unity of the chapter, such comparison becomes idle.

read: ויהי להם הגבול ממחנים. Vv. 30b and 31 are more difficult. The following suggestion is very tentative. Now, the מ of ממחנים could be a dittography, and vv. 30 and 31 seem to repeat each other. Consequently it is possible that we had originally some such statement as: ויהי להם הגבול מחנים וחצי הגלעד וכל חות יאיר ועשתרת ואדרעי ערי ממלכות עג בבשן, ששים עיר — זאת נחלת בני מכיר (מנשה or) למשפחתם (הערים וחצריהם).[35]

What period does the whole chapter represent? The date of vv. 8–28 can be easily ascertained by a study of the cities allotted to each tribe. Reuben here occupies the territory between Wâdi ʿAyûn Mûsā and the Arnon, a land later conquered by Moab. Gad was settled further north, roughly speaking, between Wâdi ʿAyûn Mûsā and the Jabbok.[36] This situation reflects the early occupation of the tribes, when Reuben was in his prime (Gen. 49^3; Jud. 5^{16}). This must have been in his earlier history for later, in the ninth century, Reuben seems not to have existed any more. Mesha did not find him, and in the territory once occupied by the first-born of Jacob now lived Gad.[37] It seems that by that time Reuben was already incorporated into Gad.[38] Now this process must have taken a few generations, for Mesha says מעלם, an expres-

[35] It is possible that originally in vv. 30 and 31 there was the same distinction concerning the territories and the tribes as that found in Dt. 3. If so, the original text perhaps was ויהי להם הגבול מחנים וחצי הגלעד לבני מכיר למשפחתם (for the original) ויהי גבולם ממחנים וחצי הגלעד). (כל חבל ארגב?) וכל חות יאיר לבני יאיר למשפחתם. ועשתרת ואדרעי, ערי ממלכות עג בבשן, כל הבשן, כל ממלכות עג מלך הבשן, ששים עיר, לחצי בני מנשה למשפחתם. This reading, while appearing radically different from the given text, is not really so. Our reconstruction reproduces practically the complete text of our document, only in a different arrangement. The corruption in the text could have arisen from the numerous similarities in its component parts. If our reading is correct, then our document, like Dt. 3, would represent also an exceedingly old tradition which incorporated within it more than the purely Israelite ones.

The fact that we offer two different reconstructions, need not be held against us. The student who attempts to reconstruct texts cannot afford to be dogmatic. His work is admittedly tentative.

[36] The fact that in v. 27 Gad's boundary is extended to ים כנרת is puzzling. Perhaps it means to say that Gad's authority extended northward only in the Jordan Valley, up to the Sea of Tiberias.

[37] Cooke, *A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1903), p. 1. Cf. above, p. 234, n. 2.

[38] See, *JAOS* 54 (1934), 174.

sion which must represent at least three or four generations. Another generation or two, at least, should be allowed for the process of incorporation of one tribe into the other. Roughly speaking then (accuracy is here difficult to obtain) a minimum of about five generations, or 125 years, separate our document from Mesha's time. By a simple method of addition, we reach the approximate minimum date of 1000 B.C. This date coincides with David's expansion northwards and southwards, at a period when both Reuben and Gad could enjoy territorial expansion and peaceful internal settlement.

The document of v. 8–28 reflects then the events of the eleventh century B.C. Whether the remaining verses of the chapter belong to the same period is doubtful. If our reconstruction in note 35 is correct, then our view coincides with that of most scholars, who believe that "Half-Manasseh" is an insertion in the text. But contrary to their views, our theory reverses their deduction, viz., "Half-Manasseh" is an insertion in the text not because it is the youngest settlement in Transjordan, but because it is the oldest! There was preserved an independent tradition concerning a tribe which was known to have been living in northern Transjordan since the days of old (see above). Another independent tradition told of the settlement of Reuben and Gad in southern Transjordan.[39] Only the desire to give a complete picture of the Transjordanian occupation was the cause for the incorporation of the older tradition with the younger one. They were never unified nor was there an attempt to make them so. Even in our text they are still independent. It is only in this light that Jos. 13 and Nu. 32 can be understood.

The next document in the Book of Joshua is Chapter 17. Vv. 1–6 have been dicussed, vv. 7–13 belong to the western tribe. We turn to vv. 14ff. V. 14 is somewhat corrupt, but the sense is nevertheless clear. The tribe was great and was not satisfied with the lot it received. The rest of this section, except for v. 18, does not offer many problems. In that verse I follow Codex B of the Septuagint and read כי חזקת ממנו; and the כי before רכב ברזל

[39] This settlement could not have begun before the middle of the thirteenth century B.C. This was proven by GLUECK's work in Transjordan. His latest publication is *AASOR* 15 (1934–35).

is כי concessive—"in spite of." Thus we get a logical sentence whose meaning will appear presently. But first let us see how this passage is generally interpreted.

EWALD[40] spoke well when he said that "we have here preserved some of the oldest historical material," which perhaps has no equal and might well go back to the time of the beginning of Hebrew prose. But other scholars thought differently, and consequently vv. 14 ff. have given rise to some of the most fanciful ideas and theories yet expressed. Following BUDDE and STEUERNAGEL, HOLZINGER[41] concluded that the Josephites were sent to conquer the eastern side of the Jordan even though "auch wahrscheinlich die jetzige Textgestalt es anders meint"![42] He further did not understand כי תוריש—"eigentlich sinnlos"—and read לא תוריש. The whole idea of the passage, including its historical significance, as well as its epic grandeur was missed by HOLZINGER. Likewise by BURNEY when he offered his reconstruction.[43] For our section does not indicate defeat but rather victory. The leader is not discouraged but rather impatient. He is here to spur the people to conquest and victory, and to stimulate them to a further advance high up into the mountains—a request expressed in the most dramatic fashion.

Indeed, we have here one of the few fragments of early Hebrew poetry and prose which could have belonged to the ספר מלחמות יהוה or ספר הישר. The people are here represented as a bewildered group disappointed and discouraged. They complain, just as they did in the desert. But the leader, young and courageous, urges them to go and cut down the trees of Mt. Ephraim. Again the people retort, "We cannot do it. Neither can we attack and defeat the enemy—." The leader becomes impatient and intolerant. Using their own argument, he raises his voice and calls: "Indeed thou art a large congregation," then he draws the only conclusion possible, "and (therefore) hast great strength." Consequently, "thou shalt not have one lot, for thou *shalt* conquer the mountain because

[40] *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I (Göttingen, 1864), p. 99 f.; so also DILLMANN and OETTLI, the latter even connecting this section with Jud. 1.

[41] Lastly, in *HSAT*, 1, 354.

[42] "Es anders meint"! A greater contradiction than this is hardly possible. In spite of the documents, says this scholar, his theory is right!

[43] *Op. cit.*, p. 134 ff.

it *is* a forest. Thou shalt cut it down." Not only that, "thou shalt also have its outskirts (תצאותיו), for thou *shalt* eradicate the Canaanites, in spite of the fact that they have chariots." How? "Because thou *art* stronger than he."[44]

This is the essence of Jos. 17[14] ff. It is the call of the leader to battle, victory and conquest. Probably long after Joseph and Joshua were dead and forgotten the troubadours of the Ephraimite hills chanted the sagas of their ancestors' victories. Among these sagas there was one which represented the cowardice and dissatisfaction of the tribe which went forward and conquered the seemingly unconquerable Mt. Ephraim, after being spurred on by the leader. The saga then proceeded to tell how the House of Joseph after cutting down the trees and defeating the enemy, finally succeeded in settling in their acquired territory, just as their leader had assured them that they would. "And in place of those woods," the troubadour would continue, "arose the mighty state of Ephraim and Manasseh—our ancestors." And the new generation of Mt. Ephraim would then dream of these conquests and perhaps of ones to come. But nowhere is it hinted that the conquest refers to any Transjordanian territory. To deduce such a fact would be to do injustice to the text and commit a sin against the spirit of the Hebrew saga. Our poem—a fragment of a cycle unfortunately lost—would then, if our view is correct, reflect the time of the conquest of central Palestine under the leadership of Joshua. The people perhaps had not started their advance yet, and were still encamped at Jericho. Long before Deborah sang her song of victory, our epic was composed; contemporaneous with the events it describes, it goes back to the thirteenth century B.C.[44a]

[44] It has been called to my attention that a similar interpretation has been already given in *PEF. Qu. St.* 50 (1918), 104 ff. The theory that Machir moved from the west to the east is ingeniously and ably attacked. For the conquest of Mt. Ephraim cf. also MEEK, *BASOR* 61, 17 ff.

[44a] ALT's brillant exposition in *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments (Beiheft 66 zur ZAW)*, p. 13 ff., reached me only while reading the proofs of this article and, consequently, could not be utilized.

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE HISTORY OF THE TRIBE.

Scholars who have discussed the problem of Manasseh—and practically every Biblical scholar has—can be divided, roughly speaking, into two schools: those who accept the Biblical tradition and those who reject part or most of it. EWALD,[1] STADE,[2] WELLHAUSEN,[3] insisted on a relatively late settlement of Manasseh in Transjordan. BUDDE developed this theory fully[4] and was followed by such scholars as MOORE,[5] NOWACK,[6] GRESSMANN,[7] BURNEY,[8] NOTH,[9] AUERBACH,[10] LODS,[11] and DUBNOW.[12] The scholars who oppose it are not numerous. RENAN[13] accepted the traditional Biblical view as did SAYCE.[14] STEUERNAGEL,[15] followed by KITTEL,[16] refused to see

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 423 ff.

[2] *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I (Berlin, 1887), p. 148 ff.

[3] *Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah* (London, 1891), p. 33, n. 1; *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (Berlin, 1914), p. 39.

[4] Lastly, in *Das Buch der Richter* (Leipzig, 1897), p. 17 f. His theory is briefly this: the House of Joseph, which settled in central Palestine in the hills of Mt. Ephraim, was too large. So Machir, who in the middle of the twelfth century B.C. was still in the west (Jud. 5^{14}), moved eastward and settled in the mountains and forests of Gilead.

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 150 f.

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 50 f.

[7] *Mose und seine Zeit* (Göttingen, 1913), p. 316 f.

[8] *Op. cit.*, p. 47 ff. and 104 f. Also his *Israel's Settlement in Canaan* (*The Schweich Lectures*, 1917, London, 1921), p. 20 f. and 32 f.

[9] *System*, p. 36.

[10] *ZAW* 7 N.F. (1930), 290 f.

[11] *Israël* (Paris, 1930), p. 384. He also believes, as do many others, that Reuben was originally in the west. This view is based on the אבן בהן of Jos. 15^{6}. This is possible. But why not suppose that אבן בהן is a remnant of the continual cross-movement of tribes from one territory to another? Certainly Jos. 22 is a clear indication of such movements and of the result that sometimes ensued. Similar movements can be traced in Jud. 12, as well as in II Sam. 17^{24}, at a later period.

[12] *Weltgeschichte d. jüd. Volkes*, I (Berlin, 1930), p. 34.

[13] *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, I (Paris, 1887), p. 214 f. and 248 f.

[14] *The Early History of the Hebrews* (London, 1897), p. 227.

[15] *Op. cit.*, p. 220 f.

[16] *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I (Gotha, 1916), p. 602 f.

in Jos. 17 an indication for a movement eastward, while Ed. Meyer[17] continued to be skeptical about the whole problem. Desnoyers,[18] accepted the traditional view with rather superficial arguments. It would appear then from this summary that the view which does not accept the Biblical tradition, has many adherents and is well defended.

Is this view correct? "Nichts im Texte deutet darauf hin!" said Ed. Meyer back in 1906. The first opposition then is based on textual grounds; and if our analysis of the documents is correct, this opposition becomes an extremely valid one. For I have shown that Jos. 17, the mainstay of the west-to-east theory, goes back to the thirteenth century B.C., before Deborah.[19] I have further pointed out that Dt. 3 preserves extremely ancient material and that both Nu. $32^{39,41}$ f. and Jos. 13^{29} ff. precede the thirteenth-twelfth century. Our objection based on these texts would by itself be sufficient to disprove the view held by most scholars. That view becomes groundless if unsupported by the documents. Half-Manasseh could not have moved (unless we disregard entirely all our documents) to the east from the west. But this is not all. We have historical objections also.

Towards the end of the twelfth century B.C., Gideon of the clan Abiezer of Manasseh summoned the 300 men[20] of his clan and defeated the Midianites, after having pursued them well to the border of the desert. Is it logical to suppose that a clan which only a few years before was left behind, while the majority of the tribe—Machir—moved eastward, would be able to gather so much strength, as to take the initiative in a battle against a superior enemy and defeat him? And later, dismiss the Ephraimites with a simple, clever proverb? Is it logical to suppose that an army would be greeted in Succoth and Penuel by clan-brothers of only a few years back with animosity? It is reasonable to imagine that a tribe of half-Beduins leaving one territory after c. 1130 would

[17] *IN*, 513; *GA*, II, 2, 223.

[18] *Histoire du peuple hébreu*, I (Paris, 1922), p. 141.

[19] Albright now dates the Song of Deborah to c. 1125 B.C. (*BASOR* 62,29). Though this date is too low it could not very well be very far from the truth (we would prefer a date closer to 1140). This fact will make the theory of the west-to-east movement (after 1130!) most unlikely.

[20] Jud. 6–8. Cf. Tolkowsky, *JPOS* 5 (1925), 69 ff.

have already established, a few years later, strong cities and a tower at Penuel? The answer seems to me definitely in the negative. If so, Machir, if it ever moved eastward could not have done so after the time of Deborah.

Our next historical objection is based on evidence preserved in Jud. 10^{17}f., 11 and 12. This, the story of Jephthah,[21] is one the most beautiful episodes of the Bible, and is wholly Transjordanic, having its background, development and end in the land of Gilead. In that story, Jephthah informed the Ammonites (or Moabites as most scholars believe) that "Israel" had been living in that territory for 300 years. Whether this number is correct as we believe, or incorrect as others think,[22] is immaterial at present. The important fact here is that Jephthah is not speaking of Machirites, but of Israel. Had Machir crossed the Jordan some twenty or thirty years before, would we not expect his name to appear either in the mouth of the king of Ammon, or Jephthah himself? Would a chieftain disregard an authentic tradition one generation old for a mythical "Israel"? And would not the king of Ammon use Machir's late conquest as additional proof to the claim he was making? Further-

[21] The fertility myth in the story is well presented by LODS, *op. cit.*, p. 402 ff. So is the problem and the summary of the preceding works in *JBL* 50 (1931), 186 ff. But the solution is unsatisfactory. I may offer the following observation: The story represents a slight mixing up of the situation by postulating what really preceded, i. e., Jephthah was originally a *persona non grata* with the Gileadites *because* of his banditry and lawlessness. Therefore he was banished. He had to be called back, however, because he became indispensable, precisely on account of those characteristics for which he was expelled. Knowing the Gileadites as he did (cf. in passing, the case of the inhabitants of Ziklag, who were ready to deliver David into the hands of his enemy in spite of the fact that he had saved them) Jephthah insisted upon complete subjection. When they agreed, he returned to his home and property in Miṣpeh, which he had left, possibly in the care of his daughter, when he was exiled. Our observation thus explains away the difficulty of his owning a home, his banishment, (his "brothers" are to be explained by the same tendency found in the Bible elsewhere to combine clans, tribes, etc. into one family) as well as the fact that he belonged to another woman, a statement which really represents the result of the banishment and not the cause.

[22] The arguments presented by MOORE, *op. cit.*, p. 296 f. and followed by BUDDE, BURNEY, SMEND and others against the authenticity of this number should be considered. Yet I cannot agree that the number is a mere invention of the compiler. Cf. also BÖHL, *DZA*, 47 f.

more, in chapter 11, v. 29[23] the term Manasseh appears. It does not seem reasonable that if Machir had just settled in the country, he would have already so much lost his identity, as to be incorporated in the greater Manasseh.[24] Moreover, since the name Manasseh appears in our text as a geographical designation is it not reasonable to suppose that a few generations should be allowed for a name of a tribe to appear as that of the land? This proof would necessarily carry the settlement of Manasseh to a period before the thirteenth century B.C. I cannot but conclude that the evidence herewith presented is overwhelmingly in favor of the view that Machir did not move eastward after the time of Deborah nor at any other time; and that Biblical tradition is right in assigning the territory of Transjordan to the two and half tribes.

At this point we are prepared to attack the problem of the origin of Half-Manasseh and of its historical development, taking into account both the problems of the Ḫabiru and the Exodus. The Ḫabiru appeared in Transjordan and Palestine in the fifteenth-fourteenth century B.C.,[25] and were an element with which any later immigrants would have to reckon. The equation ḫabiru-ʿpr-עברי seems now probable,[26] yet the ethnic character of the Ḫabiru is still unknown.[27] But the Bible informs us that during the early

[23] The verse is difficult. Manasseh here represents probably the most important part of Gilead and its usage would correspond to something like "I passed through Palestine and Judah." The *athnaḥ* after Manasseh brings to a close that part of the sentence, just as the *zaḳef* closes the next one: "and then he passed through Miṣpeh-Gilead." This site has not been identified yet, but the view connecting it with Ramoth-Gilead (e.g., *ZAW* 22 [1902], 155 ff.) has not been proven. The city must have been further south. Cf. Gen. 31[46] ff.

[24] In fact BURNEY himself says (*ibid.*, p. 318 f.), "we cannot be sure that clans from west Manasseh had by this time crossed the Jordan and made their settlement in the east (they had not done so in the time of Deborah)". This scholar would reject the documents because they do not agree with his theory! Such treatment of the text does not commend itself.

The fact that Machir is not mentioned in later documents in the west does not speak against our view. He was probably superseded in the course of time by such clans as Abiezer and was cast into oblivion, while the more aggressive Ephraim gained in power and importance.

[25] Cf. *EA*, letter 197; *AASOR* 6 (1924–25), 19 ff.; above, p. 240 f.

[26] Lastly, NOTH, in *Festschrift Otto Procksch* (Leipzig, 1934), p. 99 ff.

[27] It is true, as NOTH points out, that the Ḫabiru of Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Palestine, do not represent one ethnic group. However, there is no

part of the second millenium B.C. there were Hebrews in Transjordan, either as permanent settlers or only transients.[28] The problem of these Hebrews has been discussed by many scholars[29] but it is still problematic how many of the Ḫabiru[30] and the Manassites were among them. For we first hear of Manasseh, designating a people, only during the time of the Exodus. And the date of the Exodus, in spite of the extensive literature on the subject, has not, as yet, been definitely ascertained.[31] Nevertheless, with the help of recent archaeological discoveries, a more or less plausible view can be presented. This view claims that the Israelites left Egypt in the early thirteenth century B.C.;[32] that they could not have conquered southern Transjordan before c. 1250[33] and consequently, could not have entered Western Palestine before c. 1240.[34] Our evidence concerning southern Transjordan is archaeological and cannot be refuted,[35] nor can the similar evidence for northern Transjordan.[36] And in ʿAjlûn, where we have no positive proof, the negative one shows that the land was not occupied by a sedentary population before about the twelfth century.[37] It is a striking coincidence, one which was evident to me only towards

evidence that one of these groups, say one entering Palestine, either entered the land already as an ethnic entity, or in the course of a few generations, by close and restricted intermarriage, developed into such a one.

[28] E.g., Gen. 12^4 f.; 14^{15}; 31^{21} ff.; 33; 50^{10} (not to mention, of course, the twelve tribes of Israel). Cf. ED. MEYER, *GA*, II, 2, 222; for the Age of the Patriarchs, cf. LEWY, *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 110 (1934), 55 ff.

[29] Cf. WEINHEIMER, *ZDMG* 66 (1912), 365 ff. and more recently BÖHL, *DZA*, 31, 47 f.; ALBRIGHT, *BASOR* 58, 15 ff.

[30] Cf. recently, SPEISER, *AASOR* 13 (1931–32), 52 ff.

[31] The latest discussion on the subject, *Le Monde Oriental*, 28 (1934, published at the end of 1935), p. 1–16, fails to present the problem properly, or to offer satisfactory conclusions.

[32] ALBRIGHT, *BASOR* 58, 16.

[33] Cf. above, p. 244, n. 39.

[34] The fall of Jericho and Ai complicate, of course, the problem, which will be taken up elsewhere. Cf. at present ALBRIGHT, *ibid.*, 10 ff; *JPOS*, 15 (1935), 193 ff.

[35] In spite of Canon PHYTHIAN-ADAMS, *PEF. Qu. St.* 66 (1934), 181 ff.

[36] Bronze Age sites are found extensively, but it seems that the Ḫabiru had conquered what the Bible credits Moses with having done (above, p. 238 ff.).

[37] Cf. *JAOS* 54 (1934), 171 f., 175 f. During the time of the Judges we find cities with towers already established (e.g., Jud. 8^9).

the end of my study, that the results of our analysis of the genealogies of Manasseh agree so well with those of the archaeological investigation. Basing our deductions on these results, we present the following tentative summary and conclusion.

Recognizing the importance of the Ḫabiru incursions in northern Transjordan during the fifteenth-fourteenth century B.C., accepting the Biblical tradition concerning the "birth" of Manasseh in Egypt (i.e., the development of the tribe in Egypt),[38] and basing ourselves on the archaeological evidence for the date of the Exodus, we maintain the view that the Half-Manasseh of Eastern Palestine, who appears so prominently in the documents of the chronicler belonging to the tenth century B.C. or earlier,[39] was not one ethnic entity. The moment he entered Transjordan he lost whatever homogeneity the tribe possessed. For the Half-Manasseh known to us from the Biblical documents (those of Genesis excepted) is the product of a history of four hundred years and of many peoples. In other words, to the original peoples who wandered in Transjordan, the Aramaeans,[40] Ḫabiru, Benê-Yaʿḳôb and the many unknown to us by name, there was joined at about the middle of the thirteenth century B.C.,[41] a new group of conquerors from the desert—a group of Israelites who, having left Egypt, were seeking the Promised Land. Among them was one clan or tribe, the half of whom preferred to stay in Transjordan, while the other half went on to the west. Many were the nomadic clans already scattered through-

[38] Where the tribe came from is problematic. If the Biblical tradition is correct, Manasseh was formed of clans which came originally from Palestine and Syria, settled in Egypt, and intermarried with some of the Egyptian clans, living, probably, near the border. For the location of Goshen, see the latest discussion in *BASOR* 58, 16 and cf. WEILL's objections to the identification of Avaris with Tanis, *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 21 (1935), p. 10 ff.

[39] Cf. our discussion of the tradition preserved in the Book of Chronicles.

[40] Attention is hereby called to Gen. 31^{25} ff.; Dt. 26^{5}; 1 Chr. 2^{23}; 7^{15}, and many other references which point to a definite relationship between Israelites and Aramaeans, even to the extent of making Jacob completely an Aramaean (Dt. 26^{5}).

[41] ALBRIGHT places "the House of Joseph already in its later home" at about 1415–1380 (*BASOR* 58, 17) but he does not explain the Biblical tradition of the origin of the tribe as being in Egypt. Perhaps he still adheres to the theory of two Exodus, *JBL* 37 (1918), 138 ff.

out the land of Transjordan and the new arrivals only increased that number. The large confederacy of Half-Manasseh, which included primarily clans of purely Israelite origin, lost many of its members, who left the mother tribe and dispersed throughout the land of Gilead. To these were probably joined some of the existing semi-nomadic clans, just as some of the smaller Israelite ones must have united with the older clans. Thus were created clans and families whose prominence gave them a foothold in Biblical tradition, Machir,[42] Jair, Nobaḥ, Segub, "Gilead".[43] The strongest among them led for a long time an independent existence, as Machir and Jair did. The others either returned to the fold of the mother tribe, "Half"-Manasseh, and thus lost their identity, or became assimilated by the neighbouring tribes. As time passed, and as clan differences became less and less acute, and as national and administrative demands required it, the more important and independent clans also joined in the greater confederacy. Eventually, in the course of development, the whole population became more and more uniform and acquired the name of its greater original subdivision—Half-Manasseh. Whether, *de facto*, or only in the eyes of tradition, the population of ʿAjlûn and southern Ḥaurân invariably came to be regarded as "Half-Manasseh". It was not a homogeneous group. At first consisting of purely Israelite descendants of the House of Joseph, it later incorporated the older population around the Yarmûk basin, and finally, by the tenth century B.C., also the other clans of the land of Gilead—northern ʿAjlûn.

Once settled, what happened to Half-Manasseh? Unfortunately, our information is exceedingly fragmentary, and we can add only a few remarks. The clans must have remained semi-nomadic for

[42] The great clan Machir must have moved westward later, completely or in part, with the remaining clans of Half-Manasseh. The reason for the tribe's migration can only be conjectured.

[43] The fact that Gilead—a land—appears in the genealogies, shows that the population did not represent a tribal group. (Note that Jair was called a Gileadite, just as Jephthah was.) It became incorporated, however, in Half-Manasseh. As time passed, the Gileadites became identical, both ethnically and culturally, with their conquerors. This process must have been accomplished by the tenth century B.C. Cf. our discussion of the genealogies preserved in the Book of Chronicles.

some time.[44] Eventually, cities were established[45] and an organized government set up.[46] The social organization of the tribe was probably akin to that in Western Palestine, with its *zḳênîm*, *râše ham-maṭṭôt*, and *gibbôrê ḥail*.[47] The character of the people seems to have been one of contradictions: courageous and belligerent,[48] yet seeking assistance in time of need;[49] ready to assist those in trouble,[50] yet refusing such aid when requested;[51] faithful to the point of sacrifice,[52] yet rebellious and unjust;[53] civilized and literate,[54] yet believing in human sacrifice;[55] diplomatic with an enemy,[56] yet impatient with their clan-brothers;[57] henotheistic in their beliefs,[58] yet producing the first prophet of YHWH[59]—Elijah was another link connecting the East with the West.[60]

[44] One remembers, of course, the *ḥawwôt* of Jair. Following Haupt, Noth (*System*, p. 83) wants to see in the "Leah tribes" a sedentary population, while in the "Rachel group" a nomadic or semi-nomadic one. If he is right, then Half-Manasseh, who belonged to the "Rachel tribes", must also have been of a nomadic or semi-nomadic character. And if Noth is further right in his theory in *ZDPV* 55 (1932), 99 f., our genealogies show exactly the nomadic character we have learned to ascribe to them by virtue of the territory they occupied.

[45] In the time of the monarchy we have such cities as Jabesh-Gilead, Ramoth-Gilead, Miṣpeh-Gilead, Mahanaim, Succoth, Penuel.

[46] Cf. Jephthah, Saul, Solomon's governors, etc.

[47] Cf. Jud. $8^{14,16}$; 11^{5-11}. *GA*, II, 2, 223 f. Also Lods, *op. cit.*, p. 447–64.

[48] Cf. Jud. 11^{33}; I Sam. 31^{11} ff.; II Sam. 2^{5-9}; I Chr. 5^{18-22}.

[49] Jud. 10^{15}; 11^{4-11}; I Sam. 11.

[50] I Sam. 31^{11} ff.; II Sam. 17^{27} ff. [51] Jud. 8^{5-9}.

[52] I Sam. 31^{11} ff. Further, when Saul died and David hinted that he had been appointed king (II Sam. 2^{7}), the Gileadites refused to acknowledge him. They fought for the house of Saul, to whom they had sworn allegiance. When their cause was lost, however, they became in turn faithful to David. Cf. II Sam. $17^{24,27}$ ff., etc. [53] II K. 15^{25}; Hos. 12^{12}; 6^{8}.

[54] Even a youth could write (Jud. 8^{14}). [55] Jud. 11^{34} ff.

[56] Jud. 11^{12-28}. [57] Jud. 12^{1-6}. [58] Jud. 11^{24}.

[59] It is true that even Elijah placed a possible alternative between YHWH and Baal (I K. 18^{21}); nevertheless, with him, YHWH begins His existence as the monotheistic God of Israel. (Cf. also *AB*, 163–169.).

[60] The vicissitudes that befell the country during the time of the monarchy, the wars with the Aramaeans, the rôle that the land of Transjordan played in the history of Israel are all reserved for another chapter. We may note now that the independence of Half-Manasseh came to an end with the victories of Tiglath-Pileser III in 732 (II K. 15 f.; 1 Chr. 5^{25} f.) The country then became an Assyrian province (cf. Olmstead, *op. cit.*, p. 453).

Syrian Orphanage Press, Jerusalem.

VITA

I was born October 23, 1909, in Petach Tikvah, Palestine. I graduated from the Beth Sefer Reali Ivri (Haifa) in 1926, and from the Hebrew Teacher's Training College (Jerusalem) in 1928. During the latter two years, I attended the Hebrew University where I took courses in Arabic literature. From 1928 to 1930 I taught at the Beth Sefer Reali Ivri. The academic year 1930–31 was devoted to work of general character at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. In 1931 I was admitted to the Johns Hopkins University to do graduate work in the department of Semitics, known as the Oriental Seminary, under the direction of Professors ALBRIGHT and BLAKE, and Dr. ROSENBLATT. I also had the benefit of studying with Professors J. LEWY and E. FORRER. In 1932 I became the Rayner Follow, an honour which I have had the good fortune to retain for three years. I received the degree of Master of Arts in 1934, and in 1935 I was awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.